# MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS WESTERN DISTRICT

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE:	
WILLIAM WUNDERLICH,	Appellant
v.	прренин
DEANNA JENSEN; DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY	Respondent
DOCKET NUMBER WD79209	
DATE: MAY 24, 2016	
Appeal From:	
Labor and Industrial Relations	
Appellate Judges:	
Division Three James E. Welsh, P.J., Anthony Rex Gabbert, and Karen K. Mitchell, JJ.	
Attorneys:	
Andrew C. Hooper, Jefferson City, MO, Deanna Jensen,	Counsel for Respondent Pro Se
Attorneys:	
Robert Reeser JR., High Ridge MO	Counsel for Appellant

## MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

WILLIAM WUNDERLICH,

Appellant,

v.

DEANNA JENSEN; DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,

Respondent.

#### WD79209

#### **Labor and Industrial Relations County**

Before Division Three: James E. Welsh, P.J., Anthony Rex Gabbert, and Karen K. Mitchell, JJ.

William Wunderlich appeals the Labor and Industrial Relations Commission's order affirming the Appeals Tribunal's dismissal of his appeal from a Division of Employment Security deputy's determination that Wunderlich's former legal secretary, Deanna Jensen, had not been discharged for misconduct connected with work and, therefore, was not disqualified from unemployment benefits. Wunderlich contends that: (1) the Commission's decision lacked evidentiary support on the whole record and the Commission abused its discretion in refusing to set aside the dismissal because Wunderlich showed good cause for failing to appear at the telephone hearing; (2) the Commission abused its discretion in refusing to set aside the dismissal because the Commission imposed an obligation upon him with respect to his appearance at the telephone hearing that was inconsistent with the Commission's regulations adopted pursuant to the Missouri Administrative Procedures Act because the Commission applied a "five minute wait" rule that was not a valid rule or regulation, and (3) the Commission denied him due process in failing to notify him of such a "five minute wait" rule until it was too late for him to participate in the hearing.

#### **AFFIRMED**

#### **Division Three holds:**

- (1) The Commission did not abuse its discretion in refusing to set aside the dismissal of Wunderlich's appeal as Wunderlich failed to show good cause to excuse his failure to appear at the telephone hearing regarding his appeal.
- (2) The Commission did not base its good cause determination on any unpromulgated rules alleged by Wunderlich.
- (3) The Commission did not deny Wunderlich due process as Wunderlich was afforded the opportunity to be heard in a meaningful manner.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Date: 5/24/16

### THIS SUMMARY IS UNOFFICIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.